

Claim Amendments

The following amendments to claims **1, 2, 8, 9, 11-13, 20, 22, 24, 25, 30, 33-37, 39** and **41-43** incorporate all of the changes that had been proposed on **18 April 2007** and verbally accepted by the Examiner on **19 April 2007**, and also incorporate additional changes to correct various minor errors in antecedent basis or grammar, or to provide for a consistent use of language amongst the claims:

Claim **1**, at line 8; claim **11**, at lines 2-3; and claim **20**, at line 7: “first” has been deleted before “passkey;

Claim **1**, at line 11: “second” has been deleted before “passkey;

Claim **1**, at line 13: “said second passkey corresponds to said first passkey” has been changed to --a value of said passkey received from said at least one second client corresponds to a value of said passkey provided to said first client--;

Claim **2**, at line 2: “a first client” has been changed to --said first client--;

Claim **8**, at line 3; claim **13**, at line 3; and claim **30**, at line 3: “portable memory device” has been changed to --portable memory element--;

Claim **9**, at line 2: “from said first client” has been changed to --recorded to said portable memory element--, so as to better refer to the antecedent language of claim **8** upon which claim **9** depends;

Claim **11**, at line 3: --said-- has been inserted before “at least one second user”;

Claim **11**, at lines 4-5: “said second passkey that corresponds to said first passkey” has been changed to --said passkey having said value that corresponds to said value of said passkey provided by said first client--;

Claim **12**, at line 2; claim **20**, at line 9: “a second client” has been changed to --said at least one second client--;

Claim **12**, at lines 3 and 4; claim **20**, at lines 10 and 11; claim **22**, at line 2; claim **39**, at line 4; and claim **43**, at line 4: --at least one-- has been inserted before “second client”;

Claim **13**, at lines 3-4: “said second passkey corresponds to said first passkey” has been changed to --said value of said passkey provided by said at least one second client corresponds to said value of said passkey provided to said first client--;

Claim **20**, at line 12: “second passkey that corresponds to said first passkey” has been changed to --passkey having a value that corresponds to a value of said passkey provided to said first client--;

Claim **22**, at line 4: “a second passkey that corresponds to said first passkey” has been changed to --said passkey having said value that corresponds to said value of said passkey provided to said first client--;

Claim **24**, at line 3: --said-- has been inserted before “at least one second client”;

Claim **25**, at line 2: “a server” has been changed to --said server--;

Claim **33**, at lines 13 and 24; claim **35**, at lines 1-2; claim **36**, at lines 1-2; and claim **37**, at lines 1-2: “communication interface” has been changed to --communications interface--;

Claim **33**, at line 16; claim **34**, at line 3; and claim **41**, at line 2: --said-- has been inserted before “passcode information”;

Claim **33**, at line 17: --said-- has been inserted before “data”;

Claim **33**, at line 21: --computer system-- has been inserted after “first client”;

Claim **39**, at line 3; and claim **43**, at line 3: “by a display” has been changed to --with a display--; and

Claim **42**, at line 2: “on said memory” has been changed to --in said memory --.

Regarding the terms “first passkey” and “second passkey” to which the Examiner has objected in claims **1, 11, 13, 20** and **22**, Applicant respectfully submits that the scope of the presently amended version of claims **1, 11, 13, 20** and **22** subsumes the scope of these claims as originally worded.

Claims **20** and **22** have been amended to replace “a second client” and “said second client” with --at least one second client-- and --said at least one second client--, respectively, so as to be consistent with the other claims, thereby precluding a potential later interpretation that “a second client” might be different from “at least one second client” when used in the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the scope of the presently amended version of claims **20** and **22** subsumes the scope of these claims as originally worded.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Summary and Conclusions

Claims **1, 11, 13, 20** and **22** have been amended to overcome an objection by the Examiner. Claims **2, 8, 9, 11-13, 20, 22, 24, 25, 30, 33-37, 39** and **41-43** have also been amended to correct various minor errors in antecedent basis or grammar, or to provide for a consistent use of language amongst the claims. Applicant respectfully request allowance of the instant application as presently amended, in view of the above remarks.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Kurt L. VanVoorhies, Ph.D., P.E./ #38,643

Raggio & Dinnin, P.C.
2701 Cambridge Court, Suite 410
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
COR-001-US (1221-00001)
01 May 2007

Kurt L. VanVoorhies, Ph.D., P.E.
Registration No. 38,643
Phone: 248-364-2100
Facsimile: 248-364-2200